REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-8 are pending in this application. Claims 1-6 stand rejected. Claims 7 and 8 have been withdrawn form consideration.

Rejection of Claims 2 and 4 under 35 U.S.C. 112, Second Paragraph

Claims 2 and 4 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 2

The Examiner rejected claim 2 because the term "single beams" was not positively recited as a structural limitation, but rather as a functional intended use. The claim has been amended to change the recitation of "a hinge for connecting said single long beam to one or more single beams . . ." to – a hinge that connects said single long beam to one or more single beams . . . –. Accordingly, claim 2 is believed to be allowable.

Claims 1 and 4

With respect to claims 1 and 4, the Examiner notes that the claims recite "truss elements on one end of the other structural elements are connected, on one end of the structure to an attachment ring and on the other end of the structure to a rotateable ring." The Examiner states that it is unclear which elements are the 'other structural elements' and which elements are the rings. The Examiner further states that the specification and drawings are not enabling under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, for truss elements connected to other structural elements on opposing ends and also connected to rings. Additionally the Examiner notes that, regarding claims 1 and 4, it is unclear whether each opposed end of the truss elements is connected to at least two other structural elements or one other structural element, and are the multiple truss elements on each end connected to different other structural elements are the same structural elements. Further regarding claim 4, the Examiner notes that "it is unclear what neighboring ones of truss elements is reciting as the claims do not provide structure or structural relationships for ;neighboring ones of said truss elements,' in such as way as to enable one skilled in the art to understand, know, and use the invention."

Applicant has amended claim 4 to recite "wherein the other structural elements comprise at least the fixed attachment ring and the rotateable deployment ring." Regarding the Examiner's

objection to the term "neighboring" applicant has amended the claim term to recite "adjacent." Accordingly, claim 4 is believed to be allowable.

Rejection of Claims 1-6 under 35 U.S.C. 102

Claims 1-6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Okazaki et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,003,736; referred to herein as "Okazaki".) The rejection of claims 2 and 5 are believed to be in error, as the Examiner admits that claims 2 and 5 contain allowable subject matter. Accordingly, applicant understands the Examiner's present rejection to apply only to claims 1, 3, 4, and 6.

Claim 1

Claim 1 calls for a space frame structure capable of deployment or retraction comprising multiple truss elements forming the space frame structure, multiple beam elements forming each one of the multiple truss elements and each one of the truss elements being capable of existing in either a straight and rigid condition, or existing in a curved and flexible condition, with opposed ends of the truss elements connected to at least two other structural elements desired to be held spaced apart in a prescribed orientation. (Emphasis added.) In an exemplary embodiment, referring to FIGS. 3a and 3b, there is shown multiple beam elements, i.e., central flat beam 21 and outrigger beams 24, forming truss element 20. In FIG. 2, there are shown multiple truss elements, i.e., truss elements 20a-h, forming the space frame structure.

The Examiner argues, incorrectly, that Okazaki discloses a "space frame structure . . . comprising multiple truss elements (the combined structure of elements 3, 5), multiple beam elements (3) forming each one of said multiple truss elements . . . " Okazaki discloses a single structure with multiple longerons 3. However, even assuming the longerons of Okazaki are equivalent to the multiple truss elements, Okazaki does not disclose **multiple beam elements forming each one of the longerons 3**. To be sure, the individual longerons are single structural elements and are not each not formed from multiple beam elements. Okazaki does not teach or otherwise disclose all of the structural elements, as claimed. Accordingly, claim 1 is believed to be allowable.

Claims 3, 4 and 6

Claims 3, 4 and 6, each ultimately depend from claim 1 and are believed to be in allowable for at least the reasons set forth herein with respect to claim 1.

Claims 2 and 5

The Examiner found claims 2 and 5 to be allowable if rewritten in an independent form and to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. Applicant has amended claim 2 accordingly. Claim 5 depends from claim 5. Therefore, claims 2 and 5 are believed to be in condition for allowance.

Conclusion

In light of the amendments and remarks provided herein, Applicant respectfully requests the timely issuance of a Notice of Allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

August 13, 2007

Shane M. Niebergall, Reg. No. 44,794
HOLLAND & HART LLP
555-17th Street, Suite 3200
Denver, Colorado 80202-3979
Telephone: (303) 295-8000
Facsimile: (303) 295-8261

3749746_1.DOC